

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 9-12WASHINGTON TIMES  
23 December 1985

# Letters

## *Waterman denies being a source of CIA leaks*

Readers of *The Washington Times* have recently seen a number of articles concerning the role of CIA General Counsel Stanley Sporkin during a Justice Department investigation into allegations that I leaked information while serving as an official of the CIA.

The articles reflected efforts by Mr. Sporkin's opponents to block his nomination to a federal judgeship on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and included sensitive information which should not have been released publicly.

The articles assert that the FBI identified me as the source of leaks made to a Washington research center and newsletter on a wide variety of subjects, including the Iran-Iraq war and Libya and Iraqi political developments. They also claim that I admitted doing so and later recanted this admission.

Now that Mr. Sporkin has been cleared by the Judiciary Committee, I wish to respond specifically to these gross falsehoods concerning my activities.

I have never leaked classified information to anyone and specifically not the alleged recipient mentioned in your articles. I personally abhor the practice of leaking for any purpose whatsoever and have made this sentiment known on innumerable occasions.

I never "acknowledged providing classified information," nor "recanted" such an acknowledgement, as alleged in a Nov. 4 article. Nor did I consciously confirm information obtained elsewhere. Consistent with my mandate at the time, I did discuss unclassified political issues with a range of people, including the alleged recipient. The labeling of any of these conversations by the FBI or Justice Department as "classified" is utterly inaccurate and unprofessional at best.

The case against me is based entirely on erroneous interpretations of polygraph test reactions and subsequent distortions of my own statements as described above. I apparently reacted emotionally on these polygraphs — but not in a de-

ceptive nor manipulative manner.

One other nuance seems to have crept into your Dec. 12 article: an implication that some have claimed that the leaks being investigated were authorized by the CIA. This is ludicrous. Divulging classified information to unauthorized recipients is wrong, period.

Only two individuals participated in the discussions at issue — the alleged recipient and myself. Both insist no leaks were made by me, and no evidence to the contrary exists.

Punishment without valid evidence, gross distortion of statements, blind reliance on fallible polygraphs, and calculated smear campaigns for political purposes are not worthy of this country's investigative apparatus, nor its congressional supporters.

May I suggest an old-fashioned American remedy? Find those who really did leak the information — and who are still doing so now.

CHARLES E. WATERMAN  
Reston, Va.